



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,170	10/30/2001	Louis B. Rosenberg	IMMR-0027B	1999
60140	7590	01/31/2008	EXAMINER	
IMMERSION -THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP			BRIER, JEFFERY A	
P.O. BOX 640640			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN JOSE, CA 95164-0640			2628	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/31/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/004,170	ROSENBERG ET AL.
	Examiner Jeffery A. Brier	Art Unit 2628

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeffery A. Brier. (3) _____.

(2) Ken Brooks. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 January 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: the claims faxed on 01/25/2008 and attached hereto.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see pages 2-

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Substance of Interview

1. On January 28, 2008 Ken Brooks and Primary Examiner Jeffery A. Brier discussed in detail proposed changes to claims 53, 55, 56, 61, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 81, 82, 84, 88, 89, 91, 94, 96, and 98 provided by Ken Brooks on 1/25/2008 by fax to Examiner Brier's computer at 571-273-7656. The following is a summary of the claim discussion.

Claim 53:

Examiner Brier pointed out that at lines 8-9 "modify said input data, defining modified input data" is unclear with regard to determining step. Possibly ", defining" should be "to define". Ken agreed to change make the change ", defining" should be "to define".

Examiner Brier pointed out that at line 10 "attenuate visual characteristics" does not follow the specifications description of "reduce visual disturbances". Ken Brooks agreed to change "attenuate visual characteristics" to "reduce visual disturbances".

Examiner Brier pointed out that at line 12 "ssaid filter" should be "said filter". Ken Brooks agreed to correct the spelling of said.

Claim 55:

Examiner Brier pointed out that at line 9 "modify said input data, defining modified input data" is unclear with regard to determining step. Possibly ", defining"

should be "to define". Ken Brooks agreed to change make the change ", defining" should be "to define".

Examiner Brier pointed out that at lines 16-17 "attenuate visual characteristics" does not follow the specifications description of "reduce visual disturbances". Ken Brooks agreed to change "attenuate visual characteristics" to "reduce visual disturbances".

Claim 56:

Examiner Brier pointed out that at lines 8-9 "modify said input data, defining modified input data" is unclear with regard to determining step. Possibly ", defining" should be "to define". Ken Brooks agreed to change make the change ", defining" should be "to define".

Examiner Brier pointed out that at lines 15-16 "attenuate visual characteristics" does not follow the specifications description of "reduce visual disturbances". Ken Brooks agreed to change "attenuate visual characteristics" to "reduce visual disturbances".

Claim 61:

Examiner Brier pointed out that at line 10 "rout" should be "routine". Ken Brooks agreed to correct the spelling of routine.

Examiner Brier pointed out that at line 11 "modify said input data, defining modified input data" is unclear with regard to determining step. Possibly ", defining"

should be "to define". Ken Brooks agreed to change make the change ", defining" should be "to define".

Examiner Brier pointed out that at lines 17-18 "attenuate visual characteristics" does not follow the specifications description of "reduce visual disturbances". Ken Brooks agreed to change "attenuate visual characteristics" to "reduce visual disturbances".

Examiner Brier pointed out that between lines 16 and 17 a producing step may be needed so there is "modified input data" to transmit at line 17, however, it was agreed that a producing step is not needed.

Claims 71 and 81:

Examiner Brier pointed out that claim 71 and 81 are identical and they depend upon same claim 53 and claim 81 used to be dependent upon claim 55. Ken Brooks agreed to change the dependency of claim 81.

Claims 71, 81, 88:

Examiner Brier pointed out that in these claims "determining" should be "the determining" since "determining" step is in their respective parent claims. Ken Brooks agreed to this change.

Claims 72, 82, 89, and 96:

Claim 72:

Examiner Brier pointed out that after the wherein clause "the determining" needs to be inserted. Ken Brooks agreed to this change.

Claims 82, 89, and 96:

Examiner Brier pointed out that in these claims "determining" should be "the determining". Ken Brooks agreed to this change.

Claims 72, 82, 89, and 96:

Examiner Brier also pointed out that these claims conflict with their parent claims since in the parent claims the determining is at the haptic feedback device while these claims claim the determining is remote from the haptic feedback device. Ken Brooks proposed cancelling these claims. Examiner Brier accepts.

Claims 74, 75, and 76:

Examiner Brier pointed out that in these claims "determining" should be "the determining". Ken Brooks agreed to this change.

Claims 77, 84, 91, and 98:

Examiner Brier pointed out that these claims conflict with their parent claims since in the parent claims the determining is at the haptic feedback device while these claims claim the determining is remote from the haptic feedback device by having the processor be in communication with the haptic feedback device. Ken Brooks proposed amending these claims by replacing "configured to be communication with" with "in". Examiner Brier accepts.

Examiner Brier additionally pointed out that in these claims "determining" should be "the determining". Ken Brooks agreed to this change.

Examiner Brier pointed out that in claim 98 "computer" is present while "processor" is present in claims 77, 84, and 91. Ken Brooks proposed amending this claim by replacing "computer" with "processor". Examiner Brier accepts.

Claim 94:

Examiner Brier pointed out that this claim conflicts with the transmitting step of parent claim 61. Ken Brooks proposed cancelling this claim. Examiner Brier accepts.

Claim 79:

Examiner Brier pointed out that this claim claims "the input data" which should be "the modified input data". Ken Brooks agreed to this change.

2. The 01/25/2008 claims along with the agreed upon changes to the 01/25/2008 claims would overcome the outstanding 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejection set forth in the Final Rejection mailed on 09/26/2007.

3. The matter of the 03/01/2007 information disclosure was discussed.

Background:

On 03/01/2007 24 references were supplied with an RCE. The 03/01/2007 RCE form checked box 1.b.i. Amendment/Reply but did not check box 1...iii Information

Disclosure Statement (IDS). The 03/01/2007 information disclosure did not have an accompanying listing of the 24 references. Thus, the 24 references were not considered.

Examiner Brier reviewed the IFW file while Ken Brooks reviewed the private PAIR file and Examiner Brier noted that the listing is not present and Examiner Brier made reference to the 12/10/2007 Advisory action at pages 2 and 3.

Ken Brooks called the applicant to get instructions as how to proceed since it was apparent that to have the 24 references considered an RCE was necessary. Applicant decided to file an RCE to have the 24 references considered.

4. In summary it was agreed that the 01/25/2008 claims along with the agreed upon changes to the 01/25/2008 claims would overcome the outstanding 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejection set forth in the Final Rejection mailed on 09/26/2007 and that applicant will file the agreed upon claim changes with an RCE in order to have the 24 references considered.

5. Examiner Brier will further consider the claims upon filing an RCE.

Attached:

Copy of 01/25/2008 proposed claim amendments.



101 Second Street Suite 1800 San Francisco, CA 94105
 Phone: 415 371 1200 Fax: 415 371 1211
www.thelen.com

F A X C O V E R P A G E

Date: January 25, 2008

Total Pages: 11
(including cover)

To: Examiner Brier,
 United States Patent and
 Trademark Office

Fax: 571 273.7656
Phone: 571 272.7656

From: Kenneth C. Brooks

Fax:
Phone: 408 368-7997
E-Mail: Kbrooks@thelen.com

VIA FAX ONLY

Dear Examiner Brier:

Sorry the claims arrive later than anticipated. However, more amendments were necessitated.
 Kindly review the same and call me at your convenience. 408 368-7997

In case of a problem with this transmission, please call the Fax Operator at 415.369.7159

JOB #	ATTORNEY #	CLIENT-MATTER	RETURN TO	ROOM #
		034701/000422		

IMPORTANT: This fax transmission is intended only for the addressee. It contains information from the law firm of **TheLEN** **Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP** which may be privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Dissemination, distribution, or copying of this by anyone other than the addressee or the addressee's agent is strictly prohibited. If this transmission is received in error, please notify **TheLEN** **Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP** immediately at the telephone number indicated above. We will reimburse your costs incurred in connection with this erroneous transmission and your return of these materials. **THANK YOU.**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: Louis B. Rosenberg et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/004,170
FILING DATE: October 30, 2001 CONFIRMATION NO.: 1999
TITLE: Filtering Sensor Data To Reduce Disturbances From Force Feedback
EXAMINER: Jeffery A. Brier
ART UNIT: 2628

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Parents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450, on the date printed below:

Date: _____ Name: _____

Michelle R. Crosby

**Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

PROPOSED CLAIMS

Proposed Amendments to the Claims:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

1-52. CANCELLED

53. (Currently Amended) A method, comprising:

receiving a haptic feedback signal host command at a haptic-feedback device [to output]], said haptic-feedback device providing a haptic feedback force, the haptic-feedback device configured to provide input data to control a graphical object in a graphical environment on a display screen; [[and]]

determining, with said haptic feedback device, whether said host command includes a filter command having a command parameter, said command parameter including information operated upon by said haptic feedback device to selectively filtering the modify said input data, defining modified input data, based on the haptic feedback signal to reduce visual disturbance to attenuate visual characteristics of the graphical object in the graphical environment when the haptic feedback device outputs the haptic feedback force;

producing said modified input data in response to said filter command being present; and

transmitting said modified input data to said graphical environment.

54. CANCELLED

55. (Currently Amended) A method, comprising:

~~receiving a haptic feedback signal host command at a haptic-feedback device, wherein the haptic feedback device outputs a haptic feedback force upon receiving the haptic feedback signal, said haptic-feedback device providing a haptic feedback force, the haptic-feedback device configured to provide input data to control a graphical object in a graphical environment on a display screen; [[and]]~~

~~determining, with said haptic feedback device, whether said host command includes a filter command having a command parameter, said command parameter including information operated upon by said haptic feedback device to selectively filter or modify the input data, defining modified input data from the haptic feedback device upon the haptic feedback device receiving the haptic feedback signal by time-averaging the input data to create filtered input data, wherein the haptic feedback device provides the filtered input data to control a graphical object with reduced visual disturbance in a graphical environment shown on a display screen when the haptic feedback force is output by the haptic feedback device;~~

~~producing said modified input data by time-averaging said input data; and~~

~~transmitting the modified input data to the graphical environment to attenuate visual characteristics of the graphical object.~~

56. (Currently Amended) A method, comprising:

~~receiving a haptic feedback signal host command at a haptic-feedback device [[to output]], said haptic-feedback device providing a haptic feedback force, the haptic-feedback device configured to provide input data to control a graphical object in a graphical environment on a display screen; and~~

~~determining, with said haptic feedback device, whether said host command includes a filter command having a command parameter, said command parameter including information~~

operated upon by said haptic feedback device to selectively filter and modify the input data, defining modified input data to produce a held data value, the filtering including sampling and holding data based on a movement of the haptic feedback device without the output of the haptic feedback force to reduce visual disturbance of the graphical object in the graphical environment when the haptic feedback device outputs the haptic feedback force;

producing said modified input data by sampling and holding information corresponding to movement of the haptic-feedback device; and

transmitting the modified input data to the graphical environment to attenuate visual characteristics of the graphical object.

57-60. CANCELLED

61. (Currently Amended) A method, comprising:

receiving a haptic feedback signal host command, having a command identifier and a command parameter, at a haptic-feedback device;

outputting a haptic-feedback force from the haptic-feedback device based on the haptic feedback signal host command;

generating sensor data in response to sensing movement of the haptic feedback device;

determining, with said haptic feedback device, whether said command parameter includes a filter command selected from a set of filter commands being one of activating a filter routine and disabling said filter routine, with said filter routine being one of having a jolt filter routine, a vibration filter rout and a spatial filter routine;

modifying said input data in response to said command parameter, defining modified input data selectively filtering the sensor data according to a disturbance filter process including

time-averaging the sensor data, the disturbance filter process being associated with the haptic feedback signal, wherein filtering the sensor data is configured to reduce visual disturbance to a graphical object in a graphical environment shown on a display screen when the haptic feedback device outputs the haptic feedback force; and

transmitting the modified input data to the graphical environment to attenuate visual characteristics of the graphical object; and

updating the graphical environment based on the filtered sensor data.

62-68. CANCELLED

69. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 53, further comprising determining a position of the graphical object in the graphical environment based on the modified input data.

70. CANCELLED

71. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 53, wherein the filtering of the input data determining is performed by a processor local to the haptic-feedback device.

72. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 53, wherein the filtering of the input data is performed by a processor configured to control the graphical environment, the processor remote from the haptic-feedback device.

73. CANCELLED

74. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 53, wherein the filtering determining further includes sampling the input data over time according to a sampling rate.

75. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 53, wherein the filtering determining further includes time-averaging the input data.

76. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 53, wherein the filtering determining further includes sampling and holding a data value derived from the input data based on a movement of the haptic-feedback device to produce a held data value.

77. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 53, wherein the filtering determining further includes executing a driver on a processor configured to be in communication with the haptic-feedback device.

78. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 53, further comprising updating a position of the graphical object in the graphical environment based on the modified input data.

79. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 55, further comprising determining a position of the graphical object in the graphical environment based on the input data.

80. CANCELLED

81. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 53, wherein ~~the filtering of the input data determining~~ is performed by a processor local to the haptic-feedback device.

82. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 55, wherein ~~the filtering of the input data determining~~ is performed by a processor configured to control the graphical environment, the processor remote from the haptic-feedback device.

83. CANCELLED

84. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 55, wherein ~~the filtering determining~~ further includes executing a driver on a processor configured to be in communication with the haptic-feedback device.

85. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 55, further comprising updating a position of the graphical object in the graphical environment based on the modified input data.

86. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 56, further comprising determining a position of the graphical object in the graphical environment based on the modified input data.

87. CANCELLED

88. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 56, wherein ~~the filtering of the input data determining~~ is performed by a processor local to the haptic-feedback device.

89. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 56, wherein ~~the filtering of the input data determining~~ is performed by a processor configured to control the graphical environment, the processor remote from the haptic-feedback device.

90. CANCELLED

91. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 56, wherein ~~the filtering determining~~ further includes executing a driver on a processor configured to be in communication with the haptic-feedback device.

92. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 56, further comprising updating a position of the graphical object in the graphical environment based on the modified input data.

93. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 61, further comprising determining a position of the graphical object in the graphical environment based on the ~~sensor~~ modified input data.

94. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 61, further comprising sending the ~~filtered sensor~~ modified input data to a processor.

95. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 61, wherein ~~the filtering of the sensor~~ data determining is performed by a processor local to the haptic-feedback device.

96. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 61, wherein ~~the filtering of the sensor data determining~~ is performed by a processor configured to control the graphical environment, the processor remote from the haptic-feedback device.

97. CANCELLED

98. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 61, wherein ~~the filtering determining~~ further includes executing a driver on a computer configured to be in communication with the haptic-feedback device.

99. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 61, further comprising updating a position of the graphical object in the graphical environment based on the ~~sensor~~ modified input data.

100. CANCELLED

101. CANCELLED

REMARKS

Proposed Amendments to the Claims

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and an early allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

If any matters remain which could be resolved in a telephone interview between the Examiner and the undersigned, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to expedite resolution of any such matters. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

Proposed

Dated: _____

Kenneth C. Brooks
Reg. No. 38,393

TheLEN Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax (408) 287-8040